

Date: Wed, 29 Sep 93 04:30:17 PDT
From: Ham-Digital Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-digital@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Digital-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Digital@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Digital Digest V93 #58
To: Ham-Digital

Ham-Digital Digest Wed, 29 Sep 93 Volume 93 : Issue 58

Today's Topics:

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Digital@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Digital-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Digital Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-digital".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 28 Sep 1993 23:00:42 GMT
From: news.service.uci.edu!paris.ics.uci.edu!csulb.edu!library.ucla.edu!agate!
howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-digital@ucsd.edu

References <1993Sep27.141808.13231@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>,
<1993Sep27.175914.10643@news.mentorg.com>,
<1993Sep28.190214.9045@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: Responsibility for BBS messages

In article <1993Sep28.190214.9045@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu> lkollar@nyx.cs.du.edu
(Larry Kollar) writes:

>
>In another message, Gary McDuffie compares forging a call on packet to
>using a bogus call on a repeater. However, repeaters are not assumed
>to be running unattended (like most packet BBSes/forwarding nodes).
>[Or are they? Oh well, I'm sure I'll hear about it if I'm wrong. :-)]

Hint, 97.205(d).

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV	"If 10% is good enough	gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems	for Jesus, it's good	uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way	enough for Uncle Sam."	emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244	-Ray Stevens	

End of Ham-Digital Digest V93 #58
